1 2 3 4 5	KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney  EUMI L. CHOI (WVBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division  TRACIE L. BROWN (CSBN 184339) Assistant United States Attorney  450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055	
6 7	San Francisco, CA 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6917 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12		
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. 3-05-70991 EDL	
14	Plaintiff, ) [ <del>PROPOSED</del> ] ORDER AND STIPULATION WAIVING TIME UNDER RULE 5.1 AND	
15	v. ) EXCLUDING TIME FROM DECEMBER 15, 2005 TO JANUARY 6, 2006 FROM THE	
16	GONZALO MAYORGA, ) SPÉEDY TRIAL ACT CÁLCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A))	
17	Defendant.	
18		
19	The parties appeared before the Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte on December 15, 2005.	
20	With the agreement of the parties, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court enters this	
21	order (1) scheduling a new status hearing date of January 6, 2006 at 9:30 a.m., before the	
22	Honorable Joseph C. Spero; (2) documenting the defendant's waiver of time limits under Federal	
23	Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1; and (3) documenting the exclusion of time under the Speedy	
24	Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A), from December 15, 2005 to January 6, 2006. The parties	
25	agreed, and the Court found and held, as follows:	
26	1. The defendant waived the time limits for a preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of	
27	Criminal Procedure 5.1. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny	
28	both defense and government counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking	
	STIPULATION AND ORDER 3-05-70991 EDL	

into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant continuity of counsel.

- 2. Counsel for the defense believes that postponing the preliminary hearing is in his client's best interest, and that it is not in his client's interest for the United States to indict the case before the expiration of the twenty-day clock under Rule 5.1. The parties expect to discuss the possibility of a pre-indictment disposition of the case.
- 3. The defendant agreed to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. Failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny both government and defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would deny the defendant and the government continuity of counsel.
- 4. Given these circumstances, the Court found that the ends of justice served by excluding the period from December 15, 2005 to January 6, 2006, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Id. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
- 5. Accordingly, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court ordered that the period from December 15, 2005 to January 6, 2006, be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv).
- 4. The Court scheduled a new status date of January 6, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., before the Honorable Joseph C. Spero. The preliminary hearing/arraignment date will be scheduled at that time.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED:1/6/06	/s/
	TRACIE L. BROWN Assistant United States Attorney
DATED:1/6/06	/s/
	STEVEN KALAR Attorney for GONZALO MAYORGA
IT IS SO OPPEDED	RS DISTRICE

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 9, 2006

STIPULATION AND ORDER 3-05-70991 EDL

